

Appendix F: **Public Comments and Responses**

Comments and Responses



M O U N T A I N L A N D

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Serving Summit, Utah and Wasatch Cities & Counties

John Njord, Executive Director
Utah Department of Transportation
4501 South 2700 West
Taylorsville, UT 84119

Dear Mr. Njord:

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to review the draft Utah Transportation 2030 plan. The plan is well laid out, visually appealing, and covers the various transportation topics quite well. The main comment I have relates to the coordination and integration of the state plan with the MPO plans.

The transportation plans of Utah's four MPO's need to be integrated into the state plan. The recent media attention to the draft plan costs, that omitted the MPO project costs, has given us cause to reflect. The state transportation plan is perceived as a comprehensive statewide document, yet a major component, new capacity projects within the urban areas, is not listed. The plan does cover other urban area needs including reconstruction projects, transit, and the listing of large illustrative projects such as the Mountain View Corridor. A major expense for the state will be the reconstruction and widening of urban freeways, including I-15 in Utah County, yet they are not listed in the state plan. By omitting the new capacity urban projects while keeping other urban information, the public and elected officials are being confused about the total statewide transportation costs and needs.

I recommend that a more in-depth summary of the MPO plans be detailed within the state plan with a listing of the urban areas new capacity projects. If this cannot be accomplished within your current timeframe then I would recommend stronger clarification that the MPO capacity projects are listed in the MPO transportation plans along with publicizing the combined costs of the MPO's and state transportation plans.

I commend you for the effort you have spent in preparing this plan. I hope to continue to work together in refining the planning process and look forward to future discussions about this important subject.

Sincerely,

Darrell Cook, Director
Mountainland Association of Governments

cc: John Thomas, UDOT
Max Ditlevsen, UDOT

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Darrell Cook

Response:

A paragraph has been added to Chapter 1 to emphasize the role of MPOs in the transportation planning process. The project lists in Chapter 3 have been expanded to include MPO priority projects and to break out illustrative projects in a separate category. A separate project list has been developed to include all projects, regardless of planning agency or horizon (TIP, STIP, LRP) so a complete picture of upcoming projects is available for each area.

From: Dean Youngkeit
To: Utah Department of Transportation <transportation2030@utah.gov>
Date: 10/2/03 9:56PM
Subject: Re: Utah Transportation 2030 Long Range Plan Release

Utah Department of Transportation:

The planning partnership of UDOT with UTA announced earlier this year seems to be already forgotten. UTA rider numbers North of SLC is decreasing not growing. Many routes have been cut while riding on others has been subtly discouraged.

Long distance express routes are the most profitable for UTA while the most used Park-n-rides are full to strangle growth. The recently rebuilt Kaysville Park-n-ride is many days overfilled to where users park on the sidewalks. This UDOT facility size limits UTA growth. Where expansion is not possible on a single level, I suggest additional parking on a second level, not over the Park-n-ride, but over the entry ramps and freeway itself where bus access is directly to a diamond lane connection both directions with the Park-n-ride. The eventual elimination of excursions away from the freeway will cut the express route time to half of what it is now. That number is real because current dead head routes take half the time as their corresponding express routes.

Another limiting factor is the absence of toilet facilities. Good health for users requires sufficient hydration, but many people will not use rapid transit because of no toilets at any transfer points except at the Logan, Ogden, and Orem intermodal hubs. This means that riders purposely limit their fluid intakes. They recently closed ZCMI mall rest room access before 9:30 A.M. All ends of express routes and all collector route transfer points to TRAX and express routes need toilets. The portable type is adequate. You may not want these at riffraff transfer points, but they are most likely to remain un-vandalized where users are carrying portable computers.

Where UDOT has assigned maintenance responsibility to local cities, UDOT should require monthly oil stain washing on the concrete bus waiting areas and triannual high pressure chewing gum and other stain removal with a sand blasting high pressure water gun.

Just as most shoppers go to the newest stores, riders will use clean like new intermodal hubs instead of using their cars.

When commuter rail is considered for Cache Valley, Don't route it along old rail routes. A tunnel through the Wellsville range from Wellsville to Honeyville can make Logan by rail ~ 20 miles closer than old rail routes. It will be even 6 miles shorter than the recently re-built U.S.89-91. This is most practical because the Wellsville range is the narrowest tall mountain range in the world, the most inviting for a tunnel!

Utah needs the improved rail and highway connection to prevent Cache Valley from officially becoming a separate state of it's own. The Logan City terminal of the commuter rail should be tangent to their long needed belt route.

Another point, don't let current land availability limit planning of shortcuts. Other states use eminent domain to secure even new building

properties for long term shortcut savings of fuel and commuter times.
This should be used for Park-n-ride property acquisitions also.
Dean Youngkeit

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dean Youngkeit

Response:

The importance of adequate Park-and-Ride facilities and efficient access to these is addressed in Chapter 4. A comment has also been added about restroom availability and cleanliness of major transfer hubs. Dean's comments will be forwarded to UTA and to UDOT Region 1 who is looking into solutions to the Kaysville Park-and-Ride crowding.

From: Derek Warnick
To: <transportation2030@utah.gov>
Date: 10/6/03 12:47PM
Subject: plan 2030 comments

I tried using the web submission for but I kept getting server errors so I've sent these comments via email instead. Please contact me if you wish further clarification on any of the following points.

Thanks you,
-Derek Warnick

COMMENT 1

It is hard to access the 2030 plan without a broadband internet connection. To size of the plan is over 86 MB and that is WITHOUT the appendices!! I appreciate that it has been broken into chapters, that helps, but it is still a LOT of information to pull down.

Suggested solution:

An HTML version where every document page is a separate HTML page that can be navigated via NEXT and PREV links or via a table of contents.

COMMENT 2

I am concerned about the availability of public transportation. From my experience unless I am using public transportation to commute to the UofU or to downtown SLC, the system that is in place now is very unworkable. I have especially had trouble moving east/west in the valley and using public transportation in the evenings. Several highly populated and growing areas still have no public transit (such a Cedar Hills -- where I live).

Bike-transit travel has helped with this problem but it also needs further investment to accommodate its rapid growth in popularity (see p.48 of the 2030 plan). While I realize that public transportation needs to be run in such as way as to maximize its utility, I think UDOT can help though proper planning and coordination with UTA.

Suggested solutions:

Pay close attention to roads where public transit is not an option (such as SR-92 & highway 146 in Utah county) so that they can 1) handle the additional vehicular traffic, and 2) can build in public transportation infrastructure (bus stop locations, wide corners, etc..) into the road when possible to make adding future bus routes easier. Also, space for more than 2 bikes on a bus would be very helpful.

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Derek Warnick

Response:

As stated in the text of Chapter 4, UDOT is committed to open dialogue with UTA and Utah's other transit providers to find ways to enhance the viability of transit. A comment was added about the need for additional and innovative accommodations for bicycles on transit vehicles. WFRC and MAG are both looking at ways to address east-west movement and particularly the corridors into high-growth areas. Derek's comments will be forwarded to UTA.

From: Kerry Hales
To: <transportation2030@utah.gov>
Date: 10/16/03 8:11AM
Subject: The UDOT Long-Range Transportation Plan

I recently (today) tried to enter a comment at your website: <http://168.178.120.60/publicinvlmt/index.htm>

When I click on the COMMENT field, the page would not display:

<http://168.178.120.60/publicinvlmt/updatedata.asp>

Here then are my comments:

Plan
Topic 2: Bicycling

Your comment: I appreciate the consideration UDOT gives to cyclists. I would like to suggest that more bicycle carriers be placed on the buses since I have seen several times where the 2 bike rack was full. I suggest putting additional carriers on the rear of the bus. I also would like to see devices that would allow recumbent bikes. As it stands now, my recumbent won't fit and due to my disabilities, I can not ride a standard bike.

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Kerry Hales

Response:

A comment was added to Chapter 4 to illustrate the need for additional bike-transit accessibility. Kerry's comments will be forwarded to UTA

